

Remarks

Claims 1-22 are pending. Claims 1-22 stand rejected. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and request allowance of claims 1-22.

Claims 1-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0067816 (Bushnell) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,761,279 (Bierman et al.) and in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,324,271 (Sawyer et al.).

Independent claims 1, 7, and 15 require receiving and decrypting an encrypted caller identifier from the caller system. In addition, independent claims 1, 7, and 15 require selecting a digital content set from among the one or more digital content sets using the caller system identifier, the called system identifier, and the decrypted verification identifier.

Neither Bushnell nor Bierman disclose receiving and decrypting an encrypted caller identifier from a caller system. In contrast, both Bushnell and Bierman disclose receiving an unencrypted code and password for identifying the caller.

The Office Action provides the new Sawyer reference in an attempt to provide an encrypted verification identifier. This is incorrect.

Sawyer does not teach or suggest selecting a digital content set from among the one or more digital content sets using the caller system identifier, the called system identifier, and the decrypted verification identifier. Instead, Sawyer discloses a token or smart card that includes an encrypted caller identification (see col. 2, lines 17-19). Sawyer discloses that after performing an authentication process using the token and after receiving called party digits of the telephone call, an Intelligent Peripheral (IP) sends authentication information and called party information to an SCP (see col. 6, lines 42-51). The SCP performs a database lookup, using a CallingPartyID and possibly a certified caller ID (CCID) (see col. 6, lines 57-59 and col. 6, line 63, to col. 7, line 1). Subsequently, Sawyer sends display text to the called party telephone, including the calling party's CCID name, a timestamp, the CallingPartyID, and a digital signature.

Independent claims 1, 7, and 15 therefore include features that are neither taught nor suggested by Bushnell, Bierman, and Sawyer. Claims 2-6, 8-14, and 16-22 are allowable for the same reasons as claims 1, 7, and 15.

Claims 1-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Bushnell and Bierman view of U.S. Patent 6,553,110 (Peng).

Independent claims 1, 7, and 15 require receiving and decrypting an encrypted caller identifier from the caller system. In addition, independent claims 1, 7, and 15 require selecting a digital content set from among the one or more digital content sets using the caller system identifier, the called system identifier, and the decrypted verification identifier.

Neither Bushnell nor Bierman disclose receiving and decrypting an encrypted caller identifier from a caller system. In contrast, both Bushnell and Bierman disclose receiving an unencrypted code and password for identifying the caller.

The Office Action provides the new Peng reference in an attempt to provide an encrypted verification identifier. This is incorrect.

Peng does not teach or suggest selecting a digital content set from among the one or more digital content sets using the caller system identifier, the called system identifier, and the decrypted verification identifier. Instead, Peng discloses that a caller ID information of a caller is encrypted and transmitted to the called party (see col. 3, lines 25-31). The encrypted caller ID is the information that is sent to the called party, and is not used to select content to transfer to the called party. The called party decrypts the caller ID in order to receive and examine the identity of the caller. The called party can therefore screen the call and can choose to ignore or answer the call.

Independent claims 1, 7, and 15 therefore include features that are neither taught nor suggested by Bushnell, Bierman, and Peng. Claims 2-6, 8-14, and 16-22 are allowable for the same reasons as claims 1, 7, and 15.

Applicants submit that there are numerous additional reasons in support of patentability, but that such reasons are moot in light of the above remarks and are omitted in the interests of brevity. Applicants respectfully request allowance of claims 1-22.

Please feel free to call me to discuss the patentability of the pending claims.

Date: 11/28/05


SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER

Gregg Jansen, Reg. No. 46,799
Setter Ollila LLC
Telephone: (303) 938-9999 ext. 14
Facsimile: (303) 938-9995

Correspondence address:

CUSTOMER NO. 028004

Harley R. Ball
Sprint Law Department
6391 Sprint Parkway
Mailstop: KSOPHT0101-Z2100
Overland Park, KS 66251-2100